

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
REGIONAL BICYCLE TASK FORCE

Tuesday, July 21, 1998
MAG Office Building, Suite 200 - Ocotillo Conference Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Patrick McDermott, Chandler, Chairman	Steve Hancock, Mesa
*Mark Mansfield, ADOT	Tracy Stevens, Peoria
Christopher Miller, Gilbert	John Siefert, Phoenix
Susan Bookspan, Glendale	Betsy Turner for Maureen Mageau-DeCindis, RPTA
*Larry Martinez, Goodyear	Amy MacAulay, Scottsdale
Mike Cartsonis, Litchfield Park	Eric Iwersen, Tempe
Aaron Iverson, Maricopa County	

*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Angela Dye, A Dye Design	Dawn Coomer, MAG
William "Blue" Crowley, Citizen	John Farry, MAG
Julie Trunk, FHWA	

1. Call to Order

Chairman Patrick McDermott called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

2. Approval of the June 16, 1998 Meeting Minutes

Susan Bookspan moved to approve the June 16, 1998 meeting minutes, Eric Iwersen seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

3. Call to the Audience

Patrick McDermott recognized Blue Crowley to address the Task Force. Blue asked for clarification of the 43rd Avenue/Glendale bike project, and Susan Bookspan responded that this enhancement project would include a transit stop with bicycle facilities, a drinking fountain and benches. Blue continued by noting that more public input was needed in selecting projects. He stated that bicycle facilities on 7th Street should be extended to Wickenburg, and that bicycle facilities should be placed on all arterials and collectors.

He added that Florida is a good example of how states should incorporate bicyclists concerns into transportation planning. He concluded by stating that curb cuts were needed for physically challenged persons, and that a tunnel should be built under I-17 at the Grand Canal.

4. Status Report on FYs 1998, 1999 and 2000 Federally Funded Bicycle Projects

John Farry addressed the committee, referring to the agenda attachment which indicated the status of federally funded bicycle projects. He noted that the Phoenix project at 19th Avenue and the Grand Canal was expected to advertise on October 15, and a contract could be awarded December 2. He concluded by noting that the design portion of the Chandler bike project along Dobson Road would be accelerating from FY 2001 to FY 1998, pending Regional Council approval on July 22, 1998.

5. Canal/Mid-Block Crossing Treatment Options

Eric Iwersen addressed the committee to provide background on this concept. Angela Dye then addressed the committee to provide details of the project design. She distributed a white paper which highlighted all possible alternative treatment options. She reviewed design criteria important to the stakeholder group assembled by the City of Tempe. Important criteria included cost effectiveness, applicability to different sites and the need to minimize conflict between users. Since Salt River Project (SRP) needs to use the right-of-way, an at-grade solution that could be easily implemented was important.

Angela noted that both drivers and users of the canal needed to be alerted of the other. A pedestrian refuge was designed in the middle turn lane, and a sign was created to help identify the crossing as a canal-type crossing. The sign would also show the name of the canal, and could also show the name of the arterial street. She noted that there was extensive discussion about what type of yellow flashing light to use to warn drivers of the crossing.

Amy MacAulay noted that Scottsdale had a sign which could be used in other jurisdictions. Pat McDermott mentioned that the white paper would be more useful to other jurisdictions if it explained why some alternatives were not selected. John Siefert and Susan Bookspan noted that Phoenix and Glendale have examples of yellow flashing lights. Susan added that a sign for canal users would be helpful, especially to show the name of the arterial street. Mike Cartsonis asked if underpasses were prohibitively expensive, and the committee discussed this comment.

Steve Hancock asked if this canal belonged to SRP, and if they had to cross the canal. Eric Iwersen responded affirmatively, adding that SRP was part of the stakeholder group. Steve suggested that the crossing could be designed at a 45 degree angle so that persons crossing would see oncoming traffic.

Blue Crowley expressed concern over the cost of these options, noting that tunnels may be an option to consider. He added that painting crosswalks is a good beginning to the concept.

6. Role of Public Involvement in Updating the Bicycle Plan

Dawn Coomer addressed the committee, noting that public involvement had been received during the initial phase of the plan update process. This input had addressed issues and needs to consider in planning. She added that an additional opportunity for input could occur when selecting routes for the regional plan. She discussed the possible options discussed in the agenda, then asked for committee input.

Aaron Iverson noted that holding an open house specific to the bike plan update may be more effective than a general open house addressing all types of transportation. Blue Crowley added that input from user groups was needed and they should be included in the planning process. Susan Bookspan suggested that focus groups or targeted outreach to stakeholders could be used. She added that whatever method was used, participants should feel that their input was listened to and understand how it was considered in the decision-making process. The committee discussed additional ideas, with several noting that they had their own lists for bicycle outreach, including Glendale, Scottsdale, Chandler, Mesa, Phoenix and Maricopa County.

Steve Hancock mentioned that stakeholders may not be representative of casual cyclists who make short, local trips. He suggested that a survey would be the best way to target this group. Susan mentioned that placing surveys in the water bills would be effective. However, four to five months notice is needed for this process. Pat McDermott asked about the budget for this item, and John Farry responded that money may be available in the public involvement budget. Pat asked for a report of the budget for this item at the next meeting.

Mike Cartsonis asked what would be presented at the open house, and noted that people we are trying to reach may not attend an open house. Amy MacAulay expressed concerns that the plan update could substantially shift in focus with public opinion not representative of casual cyclists making short, local trips.

Pat asked if a proposal for public involvement could be discussed at the next meeting, and Dawn responded that it could be discussed then. Amy added that perhaps the MAG Public Involvement Process would be sufficient, and that stakeholder groups may be unnecessary.

7. Plan Update Process

Dawn Coomer addressed the committee to review the information included in the agenda. Steve Hancock mentioned that a plan map may not be necessary since local plans and routes already exist. Susan Bookspan added that jurisdictions should be encouraged to include neighboring jurisdictions in bicycle planning. Steve added that most jurisdictions don't pay attention to regional routes. He mentioned that identifying areas where connections could occur between jurisdictions could be more helpful than updating regional routes. Aaron Iverson noted that regional routes may be included in different cities, and suggested that local plans could be used as a base in creating regional routes. He said that perhaps the portions of regional routes already completed in jurisdictions could be displayed on a map. Mike Cartsonis added that MAG needs to advocate for incorporating bicycles into existing transportation infrastructure. The committee discussed this, with Amy MacAulay noting that this was a

suggested goal or objective to include in the revised plan. She added that a map is useful in determining where routes should be located in her city, and Dawn noted that Susan had expressed similar thoughts earlier in the update process.

John Siefert noted that borders and connections should be acknowledged in maps, and this information would be very helpful. Steve added that planned connections between cities would also be useful information, and Aaron agreed that the regional map should show these connections.

John Siefert added that educational materials should work towards promoting the use of the bicycle for short, local trips. Steve added that household income would be a helpful map to use in determining locations of bicycle routes, and maps of all criteria addressed in rating projects would be helpful.

Chris Miller asked if existing public transportation routes could be mapped and considered. Perhaps bicycle routes in areas without sufficient public transportation could be given a higher priority. John Siefert added that a map of congestion or air quality would be helpful. Amy MacAulay asked if off-road facilities would be included on the map, and Dawn noted that some off-road facilities were included in the adopted plan. However, this information also needed to be updated. Blue Crowley added that development guidelines were needed for bicycle facilities.

8. Next Meeting Date

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for August 18, 1998 at 1:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 2:47 p.m.